REMARKS

Claims remaining in the present patent application are numbered 1-27. Claims 1, 16, and 17 have been amended. No new matter has been added. The rejections and comments of the Examiner set forth in the Office Action dated July 23, 2004 have been carefully considered by the Applicant. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to consider and allow the remaining claims.

Drawings

The present Office Action states that formal drawings have not been received. Applicant has submitted formal drawings as requested in the present and previous Office Actions on June 7, 2004. A copy of the Transmittal of Formal Drawings dated June 7, 2004 is attached as Attachment A.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection

The present Office Action rejected Claims 1-12, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Multer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,671,757). Claims 13-15 and 18-27 are rejected for similar reasons. Applicant has reviewed the above cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-27, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Multer et al. reference.

Independent Claim 1

Applicant respectfully points out that embodiments of independent Claim 1 recite that the present invention includes, in part:

> A method of updating a plurality of applications . . . comprising the steps of:
> a) automatically establishing communication between said second and third electronic devices in response to a synchronization process between said first electronic device and said second electronic device . . .;
> b) at said second electronic device, automatically determining if said third electronic device has a newer version of said first application than the version of said first application located on said first electronic device . . . and
> d) after receiving said newer version, automatically storing said newer version of said first application on said first electronic device when synchronizing said first electronic device with said second electronic device in a later performed synchronization process . . . (Emphasis Added)

Embodiments of the present invention pertain to methods for updating applications on an electronic device. In particular, embodiments of independent Claim 1 recite that communication is established between a second and third electronic device for the purposes of updating a first application on the first electronic device with a version of the first application on the third electronic device. This communication is established in response to a synchronization

process between the first and second electronic devices. More specifically, the second electronic device automatically determines if the third electronic device has a newer version of the first application than that currently stored on the first electronic device.

Applicant respectfully notes that the prior art reference, Multer et al., does not teach nor suggest the claimed method for updating applications that comprises, in particular, in response to a synchronization process between a first and second electronic device, automatically determining at the second electronic device if a third electronic device has a newer version of the first application than that stored on the first electronic device, as claimed in independent Claim 1 of the present invention.

In contrast to independent Claim 1 of the present invention, the Multer et al. reference, discloses the synchronization between two synchronizing devices, the first and third devices as represented in independent Claim 1. That is, synchronization occurs between the first and third devices. In particular, the Multer et al. reference discloses synchronization engines at both ends of synchronizing devices that determine differences between the files located on the synchronizing devices. That is, each synchronizing device has a sync engine that determines whether a data file located on that synchronizing device has

been changed with respect to the same data file located on other synchronizing devices. In particular, in all of the examples provided in Figures 1-5, the differencing synchronizer 104 that provides the synchronizing functionality is located at the synchronizing devices, the first and third devices as represented in the present independent Claim 1. That is, the differencing synchronizer 104 is not located at an intermediary storage device, a second device as represented, for example storage server 300 of Figure 3. Moreover, Figure 8 as described in column 10 of the Multer et al. reference discloses a storage server 850 which is a dumb storage server, in which each of the device engines transmits only difference information thereto to be stored that is accessible by other device engines.

As a result, Applicant respectfully asserts that the storage device does not "detect the update or difference and then the storage device synchronizing the system A and system B," as recited on page 8 of the present Office Action. That is, between a first represented device, system A, and a third represented device, system B, the intermediary storage device, representing a second device, is not "interpreted" to detect the update occurring on system B, and is not "interpreted" to further synchronize the updated content with system A, as recited on page 8 of the present Office Action. In fact, as shown in Figure 3 of the Multer et al. reference, "the differencing synchronizer 104 located at system A or B

will extract changes made to the information on either system A or system B and transmit the changed information between the systems, including storing the changed information at an intermediary storage device. That is, the first and third devices as represented in independent Claim 1 performs the synchronization of data between the two devices.

Even if the intermediary storage device, representing a second device, is interpreted to detect updates occurring on system B, a synchronization process is not performed between system A and the intermediary storage device, as is recited in independent Claim 1 of the present invention. That is, the Multer et al. reference still discloses synchronization between system A and system B, and not with the intermediary storage device.

On the other hand, embodiments of the present invention disclose a method for updating a first application between a first electronic device and a third electronic device through an intermediary second electronic device in response to a synchronization process between the first and second electronic devices, as described in independent Claim 1. That is, the second electronic device determines if the version of the application on the third electronic device is different from the version on the first electronic device. As such, in contrast to the Multer et al. reference, the determination of whether an application has been updated with

difference information is not performed at either of the first or third electronic device as in the Multer et al. reference, but performed at a single device, the second electronic device, for embodiments of independent Claim 1 of the present invention.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that embodiments of the present invention as disclosed in independent Claim 1 is not anticipated by the Multer et al. reference, and is in condition for allowance. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-11 which depend from independent Claim 1 are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable independent Claim 1.

Independent Claim 12

Applicant respectfully points out that independent Claim 12 recites, in part:

> A method of creating a personalized and up-to-date application over a communication network comprising the steps of:
>
> a) receiving at a third electronic device from a second electronic device over said communication network a request for a newer version of a web clipping application, said request resulting from synchronizing said second electronic device with a first electronic device and determining that said third electronic device has said newer version than the version of said web clipping application located on said first electronic device, said first electronic device coupled to said second electronic device;
>
> b) identifying a user associated with said first electronic device;

c) accessing information particular to said user;

d) dynamically creating an up-to-date web clipping application that is personalized to said user using said information; and

e) sending said personalized and up-to-date web clipping application to said second electronic device.

Independent Claim 12 of the present invention pertains to a method for creating up-to-date personalized applications on an electronic device. In particular, independent Claim 12 recites that communication is established between a second and third electronic device for the purposes of creating personalized applications that are updated and located on a first electronic device, in response to a synchronization process between the first and second electronic device.

Applicant respectfully notes that the prior art reference, Multer et al., does not teach nor suggest the claimed method for creating a personalized web-clipping application that is updated and comprises, in particular, determining at a second electronic device, upon synchronizing with the first electronic device, if the third electronic device has a newer version of the first web-clipping application than that stored on the first electronic device, as described in independent Claim 12 of the present invention. Specifically, Applicant is unable to determine where in column 4, lines 19-30 of the Multer et al. reference does it disclose a personalized web-clipping application that

is updated in response to a synchronization between a first and second electronic device. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to specifically point out where the Multer et al. reference describes a personalized web clipping application that is updated.

For those reasons above and for analogous arguments regarding independent Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention as disclosed in independent Claim 12 is not anticipated or rendered obvious by the Multer et al. reference, and is in a condition for allowance. Specifically, the Multer et al. reference discloses the synchronization between "a first and second resident on a first and second system, respectfully." That is, synchronization occurs between a first and second system in the Multer et al. reference, and not at an intermediary server, which is in direct contrast to embodiments of the present invention as recited in independent Claim 12, which recites that a first and second electronic device are synchronized, in which the second electronic device is the intermediary device. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 13-15 which depend from independent Claim 12 are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable independent Claim 12.

Independent Claim 17

Applicant respectfully points out that independent Claim 17 recites a system of the present invention including, in part:

> A system comprising a first electronic device containing a plurality of applications, a second electronic device . . . [that] contains instructions that when executed implement of method of updating said plurality of applications, said method comprising the steps of:
>
> a) automatically establishing communication with a third electronic device coupled to said communication network that supports a first application from said plurality of applications, said establishing communication performed while said first electronic device is not coupled to said second electronic device and in response to a synchronization process between said first electronic device and said second electronic device; and
>
> d) . . . automatically storing said newer version of said first application on said first electronic device when synchronizing said first electronic device with said second electronic device in a later performed synchronization process, wherein said first electronic device is coupled to said second electronic device for synchronization. (Emphasis Added)

Embodiments of independent Claim 17 of the present invention pertain to a system for updating applications on an electronic device. In particular, embodiments of independent Claim 17 recite that the system establishes communication between a second and third electronic device for the purposes of updating applications located on a first electronic device.

For arguments analogous with respect to independent Claims 1 and 12, Applicant respectfully notes that the prior art reference, Multer et al., does not teach nor suggest the present system for updating applications that comprises, in particular, automatically determining at a second electronic device if the third electronic device has a newer version of the first application than that stored on the first electronic device in response to a synchronization process between the first and second electronic device, as claimed in independent Claim 17 of the present invention.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention as disclosed in independent Claim 17 is not anticipated by the Multer et al. reference, and is in a condition for allowance. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 18-27 which depend from independent Claim 17 are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable independent Claim 17.

CONCLUSION

In light of the facts and arguments presented herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected Claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1-27 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, Applicant respectfully solicits allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: 25 October 2004

Lin C. Hsu
Reg. No.: 46,315
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113